

**REMARKS/RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

By this amendment, Applicant hereby amends the specification to correct minor errors.

In a restriction requirement dated May 19, 2008, the Examiner required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 and 372 between

- Group I - Claims 1-2, which the Examiner characterized as drawn to a method to measure sensitivity by generating “translational” motion;
- Group II - Claims 6-7, which the Examiner characterized as drawn to a method to measure sensitive (sic) by generating rotational vibration;
- Group III - Claim 3, which the Examiner characterized as drawn to an accelerometer with a casing having perpendicular planes; and
- Group IV - Claim 13, which the Examiner characterized as drawn to an accelerometer with diffraction grating around a rotational axis of the sensor.

The Examiner further noted that claims 4, 5, 8-11, 14 and 15 were improper multiple dependent claims.

Applicant provisionally elect to prosecute Group II, claims 6-7 which the Examiner characterized as drawn to a method to measure sensitive (sic) by generating rotational vibration. Further, Applicant has amended claims 8 and 9 to no longer be in improper multiple dependent format, and respectfully requests the examination and consideration of these claims, which now depend from “any one of claims 6 and 7.”

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 18, 2008

By: 

John M. Romary  
Reg. No. 26,331

1620703v1